

Job Training Partnership Act funds, and I will talk about those a little more and show how important they are, they cut that back.

Why did they do all of that? Why did they make all these big cuts? Well, here is why. They want to give later on, not next week, not this week, a big tax cut. Who gets the big tax cut? Well, if you make over \$100,000, and members of Congress do that, folks, and they are doing it maybe a little bit for themselves, if you make over \$100,000, you are going to get 51½ percent of the total cuts. People making that money get over half of it.

How did the people on the low end of the scale, say, zero to \$30,000? They get 4.8 percent of the cuts. I guess they do not need anything. It is the wealthy that needs the money. How about people between the wages of \$30,000 to \$50,000? I have got a lot of those in my district. They are middle income. They should get some money. Well, they get 11.6 percent of the cut.

People with wages of \$50,000 to \$75,000, they get 16.4 percent of the cuts. And \$75,000 to \$100,000, now we are getting in the upper brackets again, 15.2 percent of the cuts. So we know what they are doing. They are taking the money from the poor, the needy, and kids, and they are going to give it to the wealthy.

The other thing I would like to talk about are three young ladies, and I met with these three young ladies this last weekend, Ms. Keneetha Jackson, Ms. Shauntel Freelon, and Ms. Reba Brown. Who are they? They have not made national news or anything, but who are they? They are three young ladies who have children who used to be on welfare. They are no longer on welfare. Nor do they ever want to be on welfare again. They have been through the welfare cycle. They are no longer on the welfare cycle because they used some training programs, including principally the Job Training Partnership Act which the Republicans just cut last Thursday in the rescission bill, just last week cut it. Yet that program was primarily responsible so these people did not have to continue to stay on welfare.

They did not want to be on welfare. They did not like being on welfare. But one of them specifically pointed out to me in going through their life's history, each one of them did, that she had no alternative, she tried working after she had her first baby, she tried working at McDonald's and fast food places and she could not make it, she could not provide for her children and do it. So she found out about training programs. She entered into it.

All three of these are very proud of the fact that they are no longer on welfare. We have a lot more people out there that same way that want to get off welfare. Under the Deal bill, which will be a substitute for the Republican proposal, they will have a lot better chance of getting off welfare, of being able to be trained to get off welfare.

I agree we need to get and help people off welfare. We do not need to just give people a handout which we have done in the past. But we need to give them a hand up. We need to help them get up out of there. It can be done.

Here are three success cases. I am going to ask all of you, I know there are a few people out there who know the answer to this but there are not very many. Which one of these 3 that I mentioned this coming May will get a bachelor's degree in business administration from my alma mater, the University of Missouri in Columbia. That is right, folks. They are all determined to continue on this road to success, out of welfare.

I can tell you, it is Ms. Keneetha Jackson. She will be proud to be up there in May getting her degree. Then she tells you, that is not the end. She wants to go further and she wants her children to go further.

I dare say that none of these former welfare mothers' children will ever be on welfare because they too know what their mother has done.

DISTORTION OF TRUTH AND PARTISAN BICKERING IN WELFARE REFORM DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, we have heard here this morning quite a bit of comment and suggestion about the debate that is going to take place on this House floor later today about welfare reform. Unfortunately, I would have to characterize it as partisan bickering. It is distortion of the truth and partisan bickering.

I really believe this Nation deserves better than partisan rhetoric, half truths, mistruths and bickering. We have a serious problem because of our welfare system. Yet the other side of the aisle, who controlled this body for so many years, did nothing to reform that system. Now that we have a reform plan before us, we have partisan rhetoric, bickering, and half truths.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is time to put America first. Cut out the rhetoric, the partisan bickering, the half truths.

If you have a better proposal, we will be glad to hear it. But it is time that we address that system. It is time that we put partisan bickering behind us. The American people want and should expect a welfare system that works.

We have a system now that does not ever encourage you to get off. We just keep paying. And, yes, some of the reforms are difficult. But why were those reforms not brought forth before? The majority of the experts on this in this country will tell you it is going to take tough reforms to change our welfare system.

What are we going to be debating here today? Yes, we have to talk about what is wrong with our system. Why we have so many people who get on

AFDC and stay there for years. Why we have families that are on that program for generations and do not get off.

I think if anybody would look at the way the program is set up and would see how we dole out the money, they would realize psychologically it is a trap for people. It is not something that gives you the helping hand up and out.

That is what we will be debating here today. How do we get the people that are on AFDC into paying jobs? How do we give them the self-respect so that they can raise themselves and their families up in our society?

Funding for welfare programs is out of control. It fits right in with the need to balance the budget. Of course on the other side, all we get when we propose a cut is rhetoric and partisan bickering. They do not bring forward cuts to balance the budget. Goodness no, only give the Republicans a hard time because they are trying to balance the budget.

But the welfare costs are going to increase from \$325 billion to almost \$500 billion by 1998. How do we ever balance the budget with runaway welfare programs like that?

We have spent \$5 trillion on welfare. The system has not worked. We still have people mired in this system. There are some very important provisions to the bill that we are going to talk about in the next few days, things that are supported by the great number of working American taxpayers. When we hear the partisan bickering and the rhetoric from the other side, we need to focus on the working American taxpayers who are not being represented in that type of debate.

We want to make a tough work requirement in our welfare system. We want to eliminate awards for having children out of wedlock to get more welfare. We will have many important elements to debate, those are just a few, in the days ahead. But what we do here today is for our children, for the next generation, for the long term, for the survival of our country.

DSG SPECIAL REPORT ON REPUBLICAN CONTRACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to advise Members of the publication today of the first special report being issued by the newly reorganized Democratic Study Group. It is a special report entitled "Cheating Children: The Real Meaning of the Republican Contract." It really is a catalog of the contract's attacks on the kids of America. It goes through in a very systematic fashion the various bills that we have already acted upon, particularly the welfare bill that will be in front of the House this week, and lays out exactly

what each of them will do to the children of America.

First off, taking food from children. The welfare bill that we will have before us later this week when all is said and done with the various block grants on nutrition programs will mean a loss over the next 5 years of \$6.5 billion compared to what would have been provided to hungry and needy kids. Where all does this take place? Well, in the very, very successful program for women, infants and children, early childhood care, we will have a cut that will deprive over 400,000 needy families that were otherwise entitled to help under the WIC Program.

School Lunch and School Breakfast Programs under the new block grant, even if fully funded at the authorized level, will be almost \$2.5 billion below what would otherwise have been required under existing law, a really penny-wise and pound-foolish strategy given all of the data we have about how effective these school feeding programs have been in improving learning in this country.

Food stamps will be cut by over \$14 billion over the next 5 years under the welfare bill that will be coming up under Republican sponsorship, changes that would take food stamps away from over 2 million Americans over the next 5 years and reduce the level of support to the participants that remain.

At the level estimated by the Congressional Budget Office to be necessary to carry out the revised program if unemployment remains low, we would have those kinds of deficits in coverage, but just think what happens if the economy slows down and more families with children become eligible for assistance? And also keep in mind, and it is a sad statistic but one that puts this in perspective. One in five children in America today depends upon food on the table from the food stamp program.

Passing on from nutrition, which is certainly a central issue, to day care. Under the welfare bill that will be coming up from the Republican side, we will be cutting funding for child care programs by almost \$2.5 billion over the next 5 years, or a 20-percent drop compared to where we would be under current law. Sadly, for all the talk about how important it is to move welfare families on to work, to free them from dependency, unlike the current law, the bill that the majority party would bring to the House will have no requirement that in States that have work requirements for welfare, no requirement that these families also get child care. Again parents bill be put to the Hobson's choice of no good child care but requirements for work in order to remain eligible for any kind of assistance to their children.

This bill will also greatly unravel the general safety net for kids in this country that is represented by aid to dependent children. Again, even if fully funded at authorized levels, which is a

big question given the resort to annual appropriations rather than entitlement status, nearly \$12 billion is to be cut compared with levels projected under current law. As the gentleman from Massachusetts commented a few minutes ago, it is truly a sad commentary that this bill will require that we deprive kids who happen to be born into the wrong kinds of family of any prospect for assistance when they are in need. The changes in the AFDC Program are estimated to leave something like 1.3 million needy children without assistance by the end of the century.

It is even worse when we look at disabled kids now entitled to some help under the Supplemental Security Income, where changes proposed in this legislation would cut nearly \$11 billion over the next 5 years. Within 6 months, over a quarter of the 900,000 kids that now depend on SSI would lose assistance.

This is not good for America. It represents a perverse desire that in order to relax the capital gains tax formula for people over \$100,000 a year, we are going to water down the baby formula for poor kids on WIC. Instead of putting money into the lock box for deficit reduction, we are going to have a tax cut that puts it into the safety deposit boxes of the wealthy.

PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. NORWOOD] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Personal Responsibility Act. With this act, we will make tremendous strides in changing the incentive structure to make people more responsible for their actions. We will bring an end to the failed welfare system that has done so much more harm than good over the past 30 years. And we will do so over the objections of those who refuse to see the disaster that the system has become.

Mr. Speaker, can anyone seriously argue that the welfare system has been a success? The welfare system was supposed to be a safety net. Instead it has become quicksand and that few people ever return from. Of familiar now on AFDC, 65 percent will remain on welfare for at least 8 years. The average length of stay for people on the rolls at any given time is 13 years, 13 years. And what do we as a nation expect in return for supporting people for years and years? Nothing. We have no real work requirement, job-training requirement, or education requirement for people receiving welfare.

Mr. Speaker, the welfare system has caused the disintegration of the family. Fathers have become irrelevant, replaced by a welfare check as the family provider. In 1965, 7 percent of children in this Nation were born out of wedlock. In 1990, 32 percent of children in this Nation were born out of wedlock.

Could welfare have possibly been more destructive to the family? Mr. Speaker, as we study the welfare system, I am absolutely certain of one thing—we could do nothing worse than to preserve the current welfare system.

Mr. Speaker, the Personal Responsibility Act is about changing incentives. It is about forcing people to take responsibility for their actions. Unlike the current system, after 2 years on welfare, you will go to work. Unlike the current system, if you are under 18, you will not automatically receive a check for having a child. Unlike the current system, if you are on welfare, having an additional child will not automatically mean another check. Unlike the current system, if you father a child, we will find you, and you will take financial responsibility for your child.

The Personal Responsibility Act will give the States the ability to deal with these issues, and it will remove power from the hands of Federal bureaucrats. Contrary to the Democratic myth, in the area of child nutrition, we are increasing funding by eliminating the costly ransom taken by Federal bureaucrats. We will give the States the opportunity to make real change, as in Wisconsin where welfare payments were reduced for those who left school, and high school drop-outs returned to school to finish their degrees. We will give the States opportunity to get tough as in Michigan, where a serious work requirement for welfare recipients met with harsh criticism from liberals, and now the welfare rolls have fallen to their lowest level in 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge the other side to join us in an honest debate about the failed welfare system. I ask you to join the debate about changing incentives and forcing people to take responsibility for their actions. But I realize some of you cannot accept my challenge; I know that some of you are too dependent on the protecting the role of Government; to you I say this: If you can do nothing more than defend this morally bankrupt system, if you can do nothing more than obscure the facts in a desperate attempt to protect the status quo, well then I would have to say I feel sorry for you. Because the American people are calling out for change, and they expect more than weak and spurious defenses of a failed welfare system.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, to defeat the forces of the failed status quo, to confront those who will distort the truth, and to do what is right and long overdue for America.

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS POSE THREAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.